



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/612,481	07/01/2003	Jimmy Lee Long	ITW-14146	3481
44702	7590	03/14/2005	EXAMINER	
OSTRAGER CHONG FLAHERTY & BROITMAN PC 250 PARK AVENUE, SUITE 825 NEW YORK, NY 10177			KIM, EUGENE LEE	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3721	

DATE MAILED: 03/14/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

5

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/612,481

Applicant(s)

LONG, JIMMY LEE

Examiner

Eugene L Kim

Art Unit

3721

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-32 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 22-26 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 and 27-32 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 11/10/03
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_.

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 22-26 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Applicant timely traversed the restriction (election) requirement in the reply filed on 2/17/2005.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3. Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. In claim 1 line 9, the end cap assemblies are being claimed as being "pivotably coupled". There is nothing in the specification or figures to show this feature. Clarification is required.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims 1 – 11, 13 - 21, 27-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Satoh et al (#6,382,100) in view of Rock et al (#5,573,629). Satoh et al shows an assembly comprising a tube with a chamber with first and second end caps 46 that are secured to fixed structure 50. Satoh et al show an air passageway 52 that extends through shaft 5, pneumatic roller 3 that is rotatably mounted on shaft means and shows shaft 5 being nonrotatable (col 7 lines 7+). Satoh et al disclose a pair of bearing means 6 (one shown). Satoh et al show transverse cut means as claimed as shown in figure 2 as well as the cuts being axially spaced. Satoh et al do not show the resilient material as claimed as well as a nip as claimed. Rock et al show a nip assembly as shown in the figures with the roller having a resilient or rubber cover (col 6 lines 10+). Rock et al show hard roller means 78 (col 5 lines 65+) working in combination with roller means 76 to form a nip. Rock et al disclose that resilient cover retains a pneumatic pressure within the roller and permits deformation of the hollow cover 86 which distributes a pressing force across the workpiece. It would have been obvious to provide Satoh et al with nip means and resilient means as taught by Rock et al to provide deformation of the pressing force across the workpiece. Regarding the slider assembly product as claimed, the examiner notes that expressions relating the apparatus to contents thereof during an intended operation are of no significance in determining patentability of the apparatus claim. See ex parte Thibault, 164 USPQ 666, 667 (Bd App. 1969). Furthermore, inclusion of material or article worked upon by a structure being claimed does not impart patentability to the claims. In re Young, 75 F.2d

Art Unit: 3721

458, 459 (CCPA 1963). Regarding specific materials being claimed, such as, the material for the bearing, the examiner notes that mere selection of known materials for their intended use are entirely obvious. See in re Leshin, 125 USPQ 416 (CCPA 1960).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.


5. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Satoh et al as discussed supra. The collars are read on element number 51.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Eugene L Kim whose telephone number is 571 272-4463. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday-Friday 8 a.m. to 6 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rinaldi Rada can be reached on 571 272-4467. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 3721

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Eugene L Kim  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 3721